

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-10, 24-33, 49-52, 65, 67-73, 75-80 and 82-88 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 24, and 49 have been amended, and claims 89, 90, and 91 have been canceled. Support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraph 46 on page 23 of the application as originally filed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-10, 24-33, 49-52, 65, 67-73, 75-77, 78-80, and 82-91 stand rejected as being obvious in view of the combination of Amin (7,171,221), Shaffer (6,477,374), and Roberts (6,208,854).

Claim 1, as amended, recites causing the handset configuring circuit to automatically use the first phone as a cordless handset for the second phone according to the change in whether or not the first phone and the second phone are positioned with respect to each other according to the relation, wherein automatically using the first phone as a cordless handset for the second phone comprises using the first phone to answer and place calls using a phone line coupled to the second phone while the first phone is being used as the cordless handset for the second phone.

The Examiner acknowledges that the combination of Amin and Shaffer does not teach this element, but takes the position that the Roberts reference does so teach at column 2 lines 1-4 and 43-47. However, the cited portions of Roberts

merely teach forwarding a phone call to a wireless unit if the wireless unit is available and forwarding the phone call to a landline unit if the wireless unit is unavailable. By contrast, claim 1 recites using a phone line coupled to the **second phone** while the **first** phone is being used as the cordless handset **for the second phone**. Nowhere does Roberts teach using a wireless unit as a cordless handset for the landline, where the wireless unit can be used to make and receive calls over the landline. Accordingly, Roberts also fails to teach or suggest the claimed element, and thus the combination also fails to so teach. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Amin, Shaffer, and Roberts, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 1 and its associated dependent claims.

Claims 24 and 49, as amended, recite wherein automatically using the first phone as a cordless handset for the second phone comprises using the first phone to answer and place calls using a phone line coupled to the second phone while the first phone is being used as the cordless handset for the second phone. Accordingly, claims 24 and 49 are patentable over the combination of Amin, Shaffer, and Roberts at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 24, 49, and their associated dependent claims.

SUMMARY

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner determines that the prompt allowance of these claims can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe Sosinski at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 30, 2009

/Joseph W. Sosinski/
Joseph W. Sosinski
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 62,807

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040